

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JAN 2 1952

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

November 1951

CHILD
WELFARE

JOURNAL OF

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC

VOLUME XXX • NUMBER 9

price 35 cents

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

Published Monthly except August and September, by the Child Welfare League of America

• EDITH L. LAUER, Acting Editor

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

Child Welfare is a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CHECKS PAYABLE TO Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N.Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Discipline: A Consistent, Non-punitive Concept	3
Helping the Child and the Adoptive Parents in the Initial Placement	6
Basic Principles Applicable to All Child Welfare Agencies	9
Editorial Comments	
Removing the Confidentiality Regulation	10
A Board Member Speaks	
Day Care is Vitrally Needed	11
Book Notes	17
Classified Ad Service	19

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS

MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH, *Board Member, Children's Aid Association, Boston, Mass.*

Policy Committee

MRS. GEORGE P. EDMONDS
E. MARGUERITE GANE

MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER
MRS. HENRY HITCHCOCK

GRACE A. REEDER
SOPHIE VAN S. THEIS

Advisory Committee

SALLIE E. BRIGHT *Executive Director, National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare, New York, N. Y.*
MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE *Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.*
HYMAN GROSSBARD *Clinical Director, Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School, Hawthorne, N. Y.*
DR. ROMAN L. HAREMSKI *Supt., Child Welfare Division, State Department of Public Welfare, Springfield, Ill.*
DOROTHY HUTCHINSON *Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.*
ADELAIDE KAISER *Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.*
FRIEDA M. KUHLMANN *Executive Secretary, Children's Aid Society, Newark, N. J.*
MARY LOIS PYLES *Consultant, U.S. Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.*
FRED A. SCHUMACHER *Executive Director, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.*
VERNE WEED *Assistant Executive Director, Children's Services of Conn., Hartford, Conn.*
RUTH WEISENBARGER *Assistant Director, Sheltering Arms Childrens Service, New York, N. Y.*
HELEN M. WHEELER *Director, South End Day Nursery, Boston, Mass.*

DISCIPLINE: A CONSISTENT, NON-PUNITIVE CONCEPT*

Norman V. Lourie†

Executive Director

Association for Jewish Children of
Philadelphia, Pa.

We must learn to use discipline, Mr. Lourie declares, as part of a framework to help children get something from people and not from rules. The goal is, after all, to enable the child eventually to discipline himself.

DISCUSSION of discipline at any time must be set in the frame that society provides. The average child in America has a richer life than children of previous generations. However, the increased complexity of life more easily creates inner confusions and conflicts than was true years back.

A simple society produces children who know what is expected of them. Our relatively unstable and complicated society produces children who are often unsure of themselves and who are emotionally insecure. When a society cannot give children a firm understanding of who they are and cannot assure them of what is desirable, moral or true, the society cannot expect stability in children or order between children and adults.

We can hardly expect mentally healthy, responsible, stable and mature children, when we ourselves produce for children one set of values in school, church and home and another set of values elsewhere. This is constantly exemplified in the difference between the precepts of school, church and home on one hand and in the "dog eat dog" philosophy in the world that children face outside.

Thus, aside from the inner conflicts arising out of disturbances in interpersonal relations, society itself contributes to the aggressions and confusions leading to behavior which adults face in children and which makes us consider discipline of this behavior as one educational means.

This discussion is centered on children in institutions and presumably implies that we are looking for the best solutions to problems that beset us in caring for such children. However, I submit that the considerations with respect to discipline are the same for children in or out of institutions.

Concept of Retaliation Prevails

Since the children are products of society's "failures," and more particularly of adults who themselves are confused and unable to give proper emotional sustenance, we need to examine first the

prevailing attitudes towards discipline. Most prevalent has been the concept of atonement and retaliation. In our law and practice the emotional urge to retaliate has been primary. Justice has not been built on rational thinking, but rather on the drive of people to demand atonement for non-conforming behavior. Despite what we have learned scientifically about the motivation behind criminal or antisocial acts, the majority of the populace will more readily demand gratification of their drive for punishment than try to maintain proven scientific principles.

In our work with children we have come a long way in giving up gratification of the drives which demand expiation and retaliation. We have come to interpret children who are atypical as sick children and not bad children. We have come to know that these children need what all children need—to love and be loved, to be part of the world, to give and to take in proper proportions, and to be appropriately creative and productive.

Some Deprivation Necessary

Our approach today, learned out of long experience, is to help children overcome their failures and to exchange their infantile, pleasure-seeking behavior for behavior which matches the demands of reality. We seek to develop judgment so that children can distinguish immediate pleasure with subsequent pain from the more socially desirable habit of giving up dubious present pleasure for assured pleasure later on.

We seek to teach that pleasure secured from social conformity is greater than pleasure secured from antisocial behavior—the possible discomfort of conformity to the contrary notwithstanding.

We know, too, that growing to maturity in our society calls for some deprivation, some beating down of instinctual drives. Too little deprivation or too much produces malformation and does not allow normal growth to take place. Training, or as some prefer, treatment, is charged with rectifying the mistakes that our society and the parents within it have made in this respect.

Our approach to discipline cannot be summed up merely by the clichés about certain types of personalities on our staffs, a sound atmosphere, the presence of love and a rich and varied program. The problems

* Presented at the program of the National Association of Training Schools, National Conference of Social Work, Atlantic City, April, 1950.

† Mr. Lourie was formerly Director of the Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School of the Jewish Board of Guardians, Hawthorne, N. Y.

we face are made much more complex by our knowledge that the same symptoms may mean different things; that two children are often clinically different although they both steal and play truant, although they are incorrigible or destructive. Some children seek punishment, others have low resistance to temptation. Clinically, our charges have problems that range from primary behavior disorders to psychoses, from children who act out in an uncontrolled way to those who are so damaged that they have withdrawn from reality and appear completely unreasonable in the face of it.

We have traveled far from the original emphasis on treatment of symptoms when punishment was a relatively simple and routine matter. We now know that our children cannot all be indiscriminately exposed to the same programs or approaches, sound as these may be. We talk about a framework with regulated and flexible controls which allows us to manage and plan the experience of each child according to his needs.

In considering discipline we need to understand how to appraise each child. The one who cannot stand close relationships or group life cannot be punished or deprived when our own mistake in exposing him to these produces the only defenses he has—aggression, destructiveness and other forms of unacceptable behavior. The same is true for children who cannot tolerate frustration, for frustration produced the symptoms that brought him to us.

An analogy often used is that of the person suffering from a stomach disorder resulting from malnutrition. He loses the ability to digest food in its natural form, and treatment consists of processing the food and giving it in small doses. Feeding him a full meal would prove disastrous.

Some Use Group to Fight Adults

Similarly, in thinking of discipline we need to think of what group living may mean to different children. Some children do not develop any strong relationships, and hence in living with a group no feelings are stirred up which result in difficult behavior. Others find such security in the group that they use the group as a tool in fighting the adults they feel are their enemies.

We need not, for we cannot, demand of ourselves, that in institutions of from 100 to 500 disturbed children each instance of difficult behavior in a child is judiciously evaluated for individualized handling in terms of the child's particular needs in treatment. Nor would this kind of antiseptic situation be desirable. There must be a structure of principles by which we live in the world. We need to guard, however, against a rigid framework which binds children

to rules more for our own comfort than for the child's benefit. We need reality, of course. But it needs to be less demanding than that in the community whose rigidities and confusions produced the ill child.

We can have no specific formula but we need a standard based on sound general principles. These must allow us to make provision for individual needs. On one hand, the framework is reality with socially acceptable standards of behavior. On the other, there is that minimum degree of functioning by a child which still allows the group to operate, does not militate against proper programs for other children, and allows for relationship with adults and some identification with the group without causing disturbance.

One precept for application of discipline is that the cohesiveness of group living must be maintained so that a mob is not created and so that the framework and control, which by themselves are therapeutic, are maintained. Discipline must consider that many children cannot develop standards of their own. They cannot identify with others, they do not trust themselves. Only the external controls, the group pressures, hold certain children together.

It is precisely because we have so many different kinds of children that we may need several different approaches to discipline in the groups we construct for children to live in. One group may be based on strong controls and accountability. Another may require us to overlook behavior that in the previous group would call for consequences or deprivations—according to the terminology prevalent in the school at the time.

We cannot emphasize too much the need to match concepts of discipline in society and in a training or treatment setting. In society the child grows only through his relationships with adults. Through their love he is able to give up his primitive strivings in favor of behavior that meets the demands of social living. And if the love is real and strong enough, the discipline used by parents tempered, and not mean or cruel, the child grows, gives up savage-like habits and accepts the social need for conforming behavior.

Since our schools are preparing youngsters for life, our approach to discipline cannot be different from theirs. With us a child lives in a framework of relationships with people in authority, in quality not different from what his parents and others in society should ideally represent. We must decide in each instance and in policy formation whether we can use discipline not as a punishment but rather as a social force for the personal and social development of the child. And as good parents we must bring the reality demands of the world in doses that they can accept and use well.

And we must not be led into the same traps that made the parents of our children fail. For the children already in confusion over their inability to control their own impulses do not react to deprivations or consequences only. We can achieve external control, it is true, but we do not thereby help those particular children to develop their own strengths and controls. Again, as we idealize what children should get from their parents, we need to use discipline as part of a framework that helps children get something from people and not from rules. Disciplinary measures can produce conformity and good behavior. But our ideal should be to achieve these by developing inner controls in the child through giving and withholding approval by adults whose approval the child seeks.

In other words, if all we want is complete conformity, the task would be easy. We lived through such programs. We didn't like the results. We rejected them.

Real Authority Is House Parents'

Certainly we want the child to meet with some consequences for his actions. But we must have a definite philosophy, we must have policies, just as we had for our punitive regimes. Our goal must include non-punitive, non-hostile staff members who can apply themselves consistently to a policy which calls for an atmosphere which is at the same time real and warm. Our staffs need to have authority and strength in the eyes of children, to represent values in standards of living, and to symbolize law and order.

It is all very well to say that the authority in our schools springs from the administration, which establishes policy, outlines philosophy and program, and carries these through by delegation. However, we must be realistic and know that for our children the real authority comes from the people who are closest to them.

The person who most often disciplines children is the cottage parent or housemaster. He establishes for the children the reality in our schools. Experience in basic living and meaningful relationships, too, emanates from him. For children previously exposed to rejection, too threatened to form identifications, who have been exposed to discipline by a variety of people, the cottage parent often provides opportunity for the first primary relationships.

To those who lack inner controls, cottage parents give a framework of order protecting them from impulsive drives. Here the discipline is direct and controlling with rules to be kept and with consequences for not keeping them. It is important to explain verbally the reasons for rules and consequences. "This is because we are concerned about you," rather

than "This is the way it is." There is logic here in using the parental analogy. A parent who does not question his adolescent boy who stays out late nights arouses the feeling, "He doesn't even care what I do."

"Substitute Parents" Controversial Term

There has been objection to calling cottage parents substitute parents, and hence a tendency to think of discipline as a matter of group control with the adult as the group leader. One may object to the concept of parent substitute and the implications for the kinds of discipline that are suggested. Yet there must be agreement that at least a fragment of a parental figure is represented. As has been said, "A youngster may be hostile, attached, ambivalent; he is seldom indifferent to his cottage parent. The relationship to the cottage parent often reflects the child's basic distorted feelings and attitudes towards the adult world and forms an important springboard in the treatment of children."

The implications for discipline seem clear. The cottage parents must be the persons of main authority in the lives of children. They must be the ones holding power, since only people who are strong in the eyes of children can offer positive objects of identification to the weak and deprived, and security and stability to those who are disturbed. It is as if they provide the child with a hard core of character and conviction around which he can measure himself in his own efforts to develop character strengths.

Discipline at this level is fundamental because we should by now be convinced that the primitive relationships growing out of simple life situations, getting up, going to bed, eating, keeping clean, doing simple things together, have the greatest meaning in the life of the child. Thus the application of discipline on the basis of warm adult concern rather than angry punishment around these simple elements can mean a great deal in helping a malformed child to grow.

Caseworker Must Share in Discipline

The caseworker-cottage parent relationship needs to be examined when talking of discipline. This represents a common problem in our schools, with the general complaint being that caseworkers inhibit cottage staff. Around the elements of living managed by the cottage parent, the caseworker can be only a consultant. The cottage parent needs to be secure in himself and at the same time ready to gain a broader understanding of the child from the caseworker so that he can keep in mind the needs of the whole child.

The caseworker has a role in discipline and authority too. It is perhaps more complicated and more difficult to apply. He needs to be identified with

authority, and in some instances concur in deprivation and let the child know it. In other situations he merely may have to explain the reasons behind the disciplinary measures used. And often, to protect his therapeutic relationship, he has to disassociate himself completely from authority. In each instance the general attitude he will take needs to be shared with the cottage staff and with others so that consistency of treatment can be provided.

No discussion on discipline is complete without reference to Dr. Fritz Redl's excellent pamphlet, "Discipline," which was prepared for the National Education Association. It should be in the hands of every staff member in our schools.

In closing I want to share a story about discipline which seems pertinent and fairly illustrates some of my points.

Two educators were discussing methods of managing children. One spoke strongly of the authoritarian approach, insisting that the child had to know his place, should take orders without question and so on.

The other made a plea for individualized understanding, saying that children should be given more consideration.

"Oh, no!" said the authoritarian, "The way I brought up my children is a good example of the success of my method. Yours would develop a generation of weaklings. Watch how I manage my son."

With that he called in his twelve-year-old son, who stepped gingerly into the room, bowed slightly from the waist and asked, "Father, what can I do for you?"

"Son," he said, "I want you to run down to the corner drugstore and see if I am there."

Bowing again, the child replied, "Yes, Father," turned on his heels and left.

With satisfaction the father puffed at his pipe and waved aside the objections of the visitor.

Soon the child returned and crisply announced, "Father, you are not at the drugstore."

The visitor, surprised and unsatisfied, decided that this was either too unreal or too harsh.

He asked permission to speak to the child and said, "My boy, this seemed rather strange to me. After all, you knew all the time that your father was not at the drugstore."

Whereupon the boy stepped closer to the visitor, leaned over and whispered, "If you want to know the truth, Mister, I didn't go—I telephoned."

HELPING THE CHILD AND THE ADOPTIVE PARENTS IN THE INITIAL PLACEMENT*

Louise Rainer

Consultant, Division of Foster Home Care
and Adoptions

State Department of Public Welfare
Montgomery, Ala.

This article stresses the importance of the caseworker's role in placement of the child, recognizing the problems inherent in adoption and the necessity of dealing with them realistically.

THE actual placement of a child in an adoptive home is the fulfillment of the normal longing of mature adults for parenthood and of a child's need to belong, in a very real sense, to a family unit. It should be the culmination of careful planning on the part of a social worker or, more often, more than one social worker, with much attention geared to preparation of the child and of the foster parents for the experience and for each other.

Through study of the adoptive home the agency gains conviction about the ability of the would-be parents to meet a child's needs for affection, acceptance and freedom to grow at his own pace with encouragement and guidance. From this study the agency further obtains a knowledge of the type of child who will be able to fit into the family and live up to the expectations of these particular parents. From a thorough knowledge of the child himself—his potentialities and his needs, both physical and emo-

tional—the agency is able to proceed with the selection of a home for the child.

Thus, at the time of the placement the agency can bring to the situation a confidence in the suitability of the plans. This confidence by no means allows for an overidentification of the worker with the child or with the plan itself. The climate of the entire procedure should be such that there is freedom on the part of the parents and of the child to accept or reject the relationship at their own pace. Neither the child nor the family is left alone in the procedure, however. The worker must be a sensitive listener, a keen interpreter and a wise counselor to each.

It is here that the prospective parents need the worker who is familiar to them and in whom they have a confidence built on a meaningful relationship. It is here that the child needs his worker who has become a familiar helper to him. Planning should be developed so that each participant will have these needs fulfilled. In some cases it may be that two workers are required. In others one worker can serve

* Presented at CWLA Southern Regional Conference, Biloxi, Miss., February, 1951.

all participants. This depends, of course, to some extent on objective factors such as agency structure and procedure. Where two workers are used, there should be a good knowledge on the part of each worker of the evaluation and thinking of the other, so that their services and procedures will be consistent.

First Meeting Must Be Prepared For

The first or initial presentation of the child is for the potential adoptive parents a tense, exciting occasion, often fraught with mixed feelings of joy and apprehension based on recognition of the import of their decision with regard to their entire future life. This tension is lessened by the skills of the worker in preparing the parents for the placement procedure and for the particular child. This preparation really begins with the early discussions of the adoption study; as the worker gains a knowledge of the family and evaluates their abilities to be adoptive parents, she gains their confidence and establishes a relationship with them. They will then be able to talk through with her their reactions to the particular child offered and to the experience of seeing the child.

Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that the period between a home study and the actual presentation of a child can be used to advantage in further preparation of the family for a child even before a specific child is considered.

The physical presentation of the child should not be made until the prospective parents have a thorough acceptance of the medical, psychological and social information the agency gives about the child, as well as an acceptance of factors concerning his physical description, former experiences, and emotional development and needs.

The adopting parents may need a great deal of help in understanding the particular child in relation to his former experiences, and preparation should be given them for problems which may arise. They will receive the counsel of the worker during the required period of service after placement, but some frank discussion of possible problems helps them to know more about the child before he comes to them.

Change Harder for Older Child

As the age of the child increases, the need for direct casework with him is greater. With the infant the change to another home can be carried out constructively. The worker's knowledge of him in his temporary home, her relationship with him and her ability to prepare the new parents for the particular care he is accustomed to will keep the negative aspects of change at a minimum.

As the child grows older, however, his awareness of people and his attachments to them increase, so that change for him may be fearful and must be introduced more gradually. A difficult age for placement is between one year and two and one-half years. At this age the child is too young for verbal explanations to be very meaningful and yet old enough to be well aware of change and frightened by it. Familiarity with the worker, preparatory experiences with her such as office visits, park trips and rides, help to ease the child's anxiety. Gradual introduction to foster parents with several preparatory visits helps the child to gain security and to experience less trauma.

The older child who faces adoptive placement has most often experienced emotionally depriving and rejective experience. He has often been first rejected by his own parents, and then for some cause suffered further rejection from more than one foster home placement. At the prospect of change his old feelings of rejection may be reactivated. The worker must have his confidence and help him to reveal his feelings about adoptive placement before actual presentation to adoptive parents. This is sometimes done through play interviews to meet the child at his level of understanding and let him act out his feelings and needs. Then the worker can reassure him. Other children can express their feelings with comparative readiness and use direct interpretation and help from the worker.

He Must Know Why Parents Gave Him Up

It is well known that before an older child can be expected to accept the idea of adoption *it is necessary for him to have reached an understanding of the reasons for his separation from his own parents.* Reaching this understanding often comes as a painful experience for the child. He may have feelings of personal worthlessness or questions about rejective experiences. He may be having difficulty in facing reality factors such as death or permanent hospitalization of his parent or parents. As these are brought out and the worker accepts his feelings and then helps him to clarify these in relation to his own worth as a person, he can move into new experiences.

"Joe was eight when his mother deserted him completely after many years of physical neglect, ignoring him while entertaining men friends, leaving him for weeks at a time with strangers, etc. Intensive work was necessary to bring this boy to express his feelings of hurt and then of hostility and rejection toward this mother. It was only as he could, with worker's help, express these feelings that he could move into a meaningful relationship with adoptive parents."

Our knowledge of the difficulties for a child in accepting adoption after he is old enough to be consciously aware of the loss of his own parents should

alert us again to our responsibility for helping parents reach an early decision regarding adoptive placement for their children.

The prospect of having a permanent home and parents who will keep him always sometimes holds special charm for a child who has had many moves.

"Mama For Always"

"John, a six-year-old who had lived in several different boarding foster homes during the time that his mother had been hospitalized with a chronic mental illness, was being prepared for adoptive placement. He was somewhat resistant to the idea of another move, but with reassurance and gradual introduction to the adoptive parents, he was able to accept the move. On the day he was being taken to the adoptive home, the worker spoke of the new mother as 'Mama Jones.' John emphatically corrected the worker, saying, 'Not Mama Jones, just Mama, 'cause she's Mama for always!'"

John's response is not unusual though not all children have the ability to express their feeling so clearly.

Even when a careful selection of adoptive parents for a particular child is made and the family is given good descriptions of the child, it is not always certain that this child will appeal to this family. This is true in the placement of very young children and even more so in the placement of older children whose appearance, mannerisms, and personality are more definitely formed. Precautions should be taken to shield the child from the experience of rejection by prospective adoptive parents. One method used by some agencies is to give the prospective parents an opportunity to observe the child without his knowledge in some public place.

"Little Jane, a seven-year-old, was rather unattractive in appearance because of a congenital malformation of her nose. When she was offered to the Bevin family, precautions were taken to protect her from the possibility of rejection. After the Bevins had learned all about Jane, it was arranged that the worker would take her to a museum and that the Bevins would join the group, but would not indicate that they knew the worker or make any conversation with the child. The Bevins thus had an opportunity to observe Jane and come to a decision about their interest before being presented to her.

"The Bevins raised some question about Jane's nose in later discussion with worker. After being told that she had been examined by a plastic surgeon who was sure that an operation when the child reached fifteen would correct this, they could make their decision to take her with real acceptance.

"On the day that Jane first met the Bevins she clung to the worker and said that she was afraid. The worker understood her fear and told her that she did not have to go with them if she did not want to. The worker stayed with Jane during her first visit with the Bevins and again when they came on another day and took Jane to lunch. Jane was poised during the second meeting with the Bevins. Her usual enthusiasm for new experiences showed itself, and she told her worker that she would like the Bevins for her mother and daddy.

"A month's time elapsed from the day Jane was first seen by the Bevins and the day she actually went to live in the home. During this time the Bevins made three trips to see her. On the third trip they took her to lunch without the worker, and the next weekend the worker took her to the Bevin home and left her for a visit. They called for her to go and stay permanently a few days later."

Child Must Feel Part of Plan for Placement

The gradual transfer from the old to the new is needed many times in placing an older child whose insecurity produces shyness and makes quick adjustment hard for him. While still secure with his worker in whom he has confidence, he should have a chance to become familiar with the new parents before actually making the move. The move then becomes more a plan of his own. Some children can make the change much more rapidly and prolongation of the procedure may arouse some question in their minds as to the real desire of the prospective parents to have them live with them. Flexibility in agency practice to suit the individual needs of the child and parents is required.

Boarding parents or institutional personnel in pre-adoptive placement situations need special awareness of the child's needs and can be of great help to the worker in preparing the child. Temporary foster parents are asked to be warm and accepting of the child, and yet to be able to release him to new parents. This is a difficult job and the worker must be constantly aware of the needs and attitudes of these temporary parents, so that they will work with her to help the child overcome some of his conflicting feelings.

The temporary foster mother needs to see her role as a part of the agency in order to be able to release the child to the worker when the adoptive placement is consummated. Her ability to do this carries over to the child and is reflected in his ability to accept the change.

The same may be true in cases where children are placed from institutions, although there is less chance that institution personnel will be so deeply identified with the child.

From this approach adoptive placement can be seen as a culmination of careful preparatory work with adopting parents, temporary foster parents and the child himself. Only as we give adequate services in these areas can we keep the welfare of the child as the paramount consideration in making adoption placements.

MARY E. BORETZ AWARD FOR 1952

Manuscripts may now be submitted for the second annual Mary E. Boretz Award. Two prizes will be given for the papers which in the judgment of a selected committee make the most significant contribution to the field of child welfare. Further details as to the deadline for submission of manuscripts, the number of copies to be required, and so on will appear in the next issue of *CHILD WELFARE*.

BASIC PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE TO ALL CHILD WELFARE AGENCIES

The basic principles presented here, prepared by the Membership Committee and submitted to the League's membership for revision, were officially adopted by the Board of Directors at its June meeting. This is the first time that such a statement of principles has been enunciated for all child welfare agencies, whatever services they provide.

THE child welfare agency, as one instrument through which the community expresses its concern for the well-being of its children, must be accountable to that community for its services. One of the obligations this imposes on the agency is to be continuously and actively aware of its purposes and objectives, its concepts of service, and its attitudes towards the client, as well as its place in the community. These are factors central to every administration that necessarily shape both program and policy. The agency should scrutinize and re-evaluate them frequently.

Such scrutiny and re-evaluation require the participation of the entire organization—board, executive, staff and membership, working together towards common goals. Joint effort of this kind proves invaluable, resulting as it must in new knowledge and understanding of each part of the agency and its relationship to the whole.

The Child Welfare League of America believes that the programs and policies of child welfare agencies should be developed in accordance with certain basic principles, principles that should support and guide every phase of operation and serve as criteria for making definitions and appraisals. We therefore submit the following as basic to the conduct of any child welfare agency, whatever special services it may provide.

I. Child welfare agencies, over and above the responsibility of carrying out their own programs of direct service, should be concerned with safeguarding the rights of all children. Hence, they have an obligation to act as spokesmen in the best interests of children.

II. In providing child welfare services, the individual dignity and integrity of people must be safeguarded. The client's right to make his own decisions and carry his own responsibility should be respected and encouraged unless it jeopardizes the best interests of children or of the community.

III. The confidential nature of client-agency relationships must be preserved.

IV. The parent-child relationship is of vital importance. Every child has constant need of

security in that relationship no matter who is responsible for his care. Therefore, the rights of parents should be consistently recognized. The need to preserve these rights when this is in the best interest of the child must be a major consideration. However, the rights and interests of the child have priority and should be placed above all other considerations. When parents cannot protect the child's best interests, agencies must take appropriate steps to insure him properly constituted legal guardianship.

V. Child welfare agencies should support, through the most effective means, sound social legislation affecting the general welfare of children or meeting specific child welfare needs. They should also oppose legislation that would, in their judgment, prove inimical to those needs.

Federal and state programs affect the lives of thousands of children and their families. Therefore, child welfare agencies should be concerned about the extent to which the intent of federal and state legislation, designed to preserve family life, is realized, with special reference to programs for aid to dependent children. Agencies should take responsibility for expressing that concern constructively.

VI. Child welfare agencies have a responsibility to seek understanding and support from all parts of the community or groups which they serve. The conduct of the agency should be based on participation broadly representative of the community or groups served. Agencies should be geographically accessible to those requiring their services.

VII. The nature of child welfare services given in any community must depend in large measure on the nature of services provided by other agencies, such as agencies administering public assistance programs, family service, juvenile courts, and agencies providing medical care. Therefore, every effort should be made to achieve sound interagency relationship, directed towards reciprocal understanding and common effort in community planning.

(Continued on page 14)

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Removing the Confidentiality Regulation — A New Challenge to Child Welfare Agencies

RECENTLY the State Legislature of Indiana adopted legislation which opened the state welfare rolls to public inspection. Following this action, the Federal Security Agency reported that Federal funds would no longer be made available to support the programs of old age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind in the state of Indiana.

This decision was based on the provision of the Federal law which requires that states wishing to receive federal monies for their programs of assistance must submit plans and have Federal approval for each program they administer. Such plans must provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the particular assistance program.

Subsequently the Congress was asked to consider certain measures which would amend or abrogate this provision in the Social Security law. We believe that child welfare agencies properly have an interest in such legislation, especially when a measure makes the following provisions:

"Provided, that no state which has, by legislative enactment, provided the conditions under which public access may be had to the records of the disbursements of grants in aid funds shall be denied its allocation of Federal funds under Titles I, IV, X, and XIV, if such state has otherwise complied with the governing statutory provisions."

This proposal was contained in Section 617 attached to the over-all tax bill (H.R. 4473) which, as amended by the House and Senate Joint Committee, was rejected by the House on October 16.

As CHILD WELFARE goes to press, the fate of this measure which would enable each individual state, by state legislative action, to permit publication of its relief rolls without losing Federal funds, is still undecided. At the moment we have no way of knowing what further Congressional action will be taken, but we do know that such legislation involves critical issues. It will have sharp impact on child welfare agencies, both public and private. This is true whether this particular proposal is enacted into law or not, because the problems that produced it will persist, the critical issues at stake will continue to demand clarification.

The Child Welfare League believes that the public must be kept informed about all phases of our public welfare programs, including the programs of public assistance. We believe that a continuing and consistent effort must be made to establish and maintain more effective means of two-way communication with the public in order to achieve a responsible relationship to the citizenry and to gain the citizen participation essential to sound public support. We also believe "that the fundamental function of a democracy is the conservation of the rights and opportunities of its people and the enhancement of their welfare."* It is our opinion that making the public

assistance rolls available to the public eye not only denies but annihilates this belief. It exhumes an approach to human suffering, long since buried, to invalidate the rights of the individual as consistent with the intent of the Social Security Act. It disregards the dignity and worth of the recipient, using a psychological pillory that may swiftly outrank its more practical ancestor. Experience in comparable areas teaches it will not do much to deter unlawful claims. Its effect on thousands of children and families rightfully entitled to public assistance grants is painful to contemplate.

Elsewhere in this issue of CHILD WELFARE we have presented ten principles applicable to all child welfare agencies which the Board of Directors of the League adopted at its June meeting. We quote from these principles:

"The confidential nature of client-agency relationships must be preserved."

"Child welfare agencies should support, through the most effective means, sound social legislation affecting the general welfare of children or meeting specific child welfare needs. They should also oppose legislation that would, in their judgment, prove inimical to those needs."

Coming hard upon the heels of the Midcentury White House Conference, at which leaders in every field concerned with child welfare enunciated their belief in the "primacy of spiritual values, democratic practice and the dignity and worth of every human being," the proposal in Section 617 of the over-all tax bill quoted above, becomes the concern of all who are interested in the well-being of children.

The League urges child welfare agencies to take up their avowed responsibility to act as spokesmen for children. This is the moment to assert the conviction that our agencies, over and above their responsibility for conducting their particular programs, have a concern for the welfare of all children. Therefore, agencies should use every possible resource to acquaint themselves with the facts in this situation for the purpose of making sound evaluation of the pros and cons, and of developing a convinced point of view that can fruitfully be used in behalf of the individual who needs help, whether child or adult. What are the principles upon which the Federal law was formulated? What are the values inherent in holding to a confidential relationship between agencies and clients? What is the ultimate intent of the agency administering a program of public assistance? What are some of the implications of the proposed measure to amend the Federal law? To what will they lead? And how will they affect the healthy growth and development of children, let us say for instance, in the families receiving grants under the aid to dependent children program? What have we yet to learn about the way to explain the ideas and beliefs that shape our public programs to those whose support we seek? What is the responsibility of the private agency in helping to bridge the gaps that contribute to public misunderstanding and apprehension?

These are but a few of the questions that must be answered as we prepare to meet this new—and it must be admitted ominous—challenge to the welfare of children and their families in this United States.

SPENCER H. CROOKES

Executive Director

* See League publication: A Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare, 1951.

A BOARD MEMBER SPEAKS

Day Care Is Vitally Needed

TWO major problems today are preoccupying the groups that are interested in providing day care services for children. The first is the problem of immediate expansion of existing services in order to meet the greatly increased need, and the second is the problem of insuring that high standards of care be established and maintained.

As a result of a spot study of member agencies made by the League, we have an impressive amount of testimony as to the growing need. In the first place, labor statistics indicate that 20 million, or one-third of all women of working age in this country, are in the labor force. Of these, one and a half million have children under school age. Even in those areas where there are relatively few defense plants, rising costs and high employment are daily pulling more women into the labor market.

We have even more telling evidence from day care centers throughout the country. Reports from the agencies included in the study show that requests for service have multiplied and waiting lists have increased from ten to one hundred and sixty-six per cent. We know, too, that the full impact of defense orders has not yet been felt by industry, and that, as defense contracts come through, a great many more women will be employed. Therefore the problem can be expected to increase, not to decrease.

The Federal government has taken some notice of this. The Maybank Bill, known as the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (S. 349), may provide funds, but the provisions for day care services are inadequate. At the time of writing, no appropriations have been made, but the indications are that they will be extremely limited.

We are well past the stage of accepting custodial care as the answer to the need of the child who must be cared for out of his home for a part of the day. We expect a day care program to provide an opportunity for healthy development, and to help the parent and family in meeting some of the everyday problems the child may have. We have moved forward a substantial distance since the first day care center was established in this country, now almost over a hundred years ago.

Although costs of day care have risen, we believe that allowing young children to be neglected or mistreated will eventually prove more expensive to society. Surveys have shown that juvenile and adult delinquency, and serious emotional disturbances, stem most frequently from neglect in early childhood. It is the responsibility of society to see that children for

whom day care is necessary should not be endangered either physically or emotionally. In the light of present knowledge, it is the responsibility of society to go further than this, namely, to provide the environment that will enable such children to have a truly constructive experience.

Detailed descriptions of minimum standards for the operation of day care centers are available through the Child Welfare League. A study of these will make it evident that the program requires the combined knowledge and skill of experts in the fields of health, welfare and education. Such high standards are necessarily costly, and it has become almost impossible for private funds to support any sizable programs. One method of helping to finance programs, of course, is to charge higher fees, but this unfortunately often eliminates the very families most in need of service. Lowering standards also may cut costs, but is certainly undesirable. Therefore it is apparent that, if we are to expand services and maintain standards, public money must be made available.

It is not enough to sit and wait hopefully for the day when some well-meaning legislator decides to do something about it. Such patience usually goes hand-somely unrewarded. Communities should be studying their own conditions, finding out how many mothers are employed, and discovering what is happening to their children. Parent education programs and child care services are urgently needed in every urban, industrial area. It is up to the individual community to discover to what extent.

It is not enough, either, merely to study the need. It is important to bring the facts uncovered and the need for action to the attention of legislators, public officials and the general community. Any program of day care must reflect the combination of experts referred to above, but it also demands the active participation and support of widely representative lay leadership.

Moralizing about whether mothers should or should not work will not solve the problems of children whose mothers are working and out of the home. They may be playing unsupervised on the busy city streets; they may be locked at home for most of the day, or under the haphazard supervision of a neighbor or relative. These problems can be solved only by communities aggressively determined to prove that opportunity in our democratic society is not just a glib phrase, but a pattern of living for all children.

ELINOR C. GUGGENHEIMER (MRS. RANDOLPH)

Chairman, League Committee on Day Care

LEAGUE STAFF CHANGES

Mrs. Helen Lehman, formerly Executive Director of the Child Care Centers, Inc., of Milwaukee, Wis., and Mrs. Winifred Allen Moore, formerly Director of the New York Kindergarten Association, New York City, have joined the League's staff as day care consultants as a result of a grant made for this purpose by the United Community Defense Services.

Mrs. Lehman, who is acting as consultant in the field, has had more than 20 years' experience in nursery school and kindergarten work. During the war she was director of the Lanham program conducted by the Vancouver, Wash., public schools, serving parents employed at the Kaiser shipyards, and also helped organize the Lanham program at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Mrs. Moore, co-author of *The Creative Nursery Center* and "Inside the Day Care Center," is working part time at the League; she is helping to organize a day care library and to prepare information to be made available to those requesting help on all phases of day care.

* * *

We are pleased to announce that Mary K. Keeley has accepted the position of Director of Field Service, returning to the staff after an absence of two years in Greece, where she was consultant in child welfare to the E.C.A.

* * *

Henrietta L. Gordon, Information and Publications Secretary, and editor of *CHILD WELFARE*, will be on partial leave of absence until June, 1952, for the purpose of doing some special writing. She will be continuing many of her committee activities and the special projects already under way. Editing *CHILD WELFARE* and heading the Information and Publications Service will be assigned to Edith L. Lauer of the League's staff.

CURRENT PUBLICATION

"HOW to Face World Crisis With Children" is the subject of the fall issue of *Child Study*, the quarterly journal of the Child Study Association of America, which is planned especially to help parents in these days of world tensions. With emphasis on advances made by the various fields and professions in their studies of the basic needs of children, and on the paramount importance of positive relationships in peacetime as well as in "emergencies," this issue is of interest to all those concerned with the development of healthy personality. Copies of the issue, which

contains 36 pages and costs \$.65, may be obtained from the Child Study Association, 132 East 74th Street, New York 21.

A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

DR. MARTHA M. ELIOT has succeeded Katharine F. Lenroot as Chief of the United States Children's Bureau. In assuming office, Dr. Eliot issued a call to all agencies concerned with the welfare of children to cooperate in working towards the following goals:

1. Let us take vigorous steps to decrease the number of prematurely born infants and to save many more of those who are prematurely born. This is the biggest front remaining in the battle to help all our babies live safely through their first year of life. It means better maternal care, as well as better infant care.

2. We must make sure that each mother not only comes through the maternity period alive, but with abounding health for herself and her child.

3. I hope we can wipe out the "black market" in babies. We know what good adoption laws and practices are, and we have demonstrated how effectively they can protect the rights of the child, his natural parents, and his adoptive parents. Let's get them operating and used everywhere.

4. We must tackle the problem of preventing all kinds of congenital defects, find ways of preventing them, and improve our techniques in helping children to overcome the handicaps that cannot be prevented. This calls for more research and for spreading knowledge about preventives that we already have. No "blue" baby should go without surgical care if it will help him.

5. Let us step up our work for children with epilepsy and other chronic conditions. With the new diagnostic and treatment practices we have right now for epilepsy, we could enable 80 per cent of children with epilepsy to lead normal, useful lives if we were to make sure that everyone got the proper treatment and care.

6. We must determine to do a great deal more for the many thousands of children who do not hear or see well. Ways and means are known. They call for combined action of parents, doctors, teachers, psychologists, and social workers. We need hearing and speech centers accessible everywhere to children with impaired hearing.

7. We must get a great deal more skilled help to children before they get into trouble with society. This means building up our social and health services for children in their own homes and communities. We already know much about the emotional prob-

lems which lead many children along the road to juvenile courts. It is time we applied this knowledge to prevent juvenile delinquency.

8. Let us wipe out every trace of brutal, degrading, and harsh treatment of youngsters in our training schools, and substitute informed and intelligent handling of these children so that they are helped to fit into society instead of fighting it all their lives.

9. Let us see how many parents, doctors, nurses, social workers, teachers, and other children's workers can be helped to understand what is known about the emotional and social development of children, so that they can put this knowledge into their everyday dealings with parents and with children. We should start on this job in the doctor's office; in maternity and child health clinics; in nursery schools and day nurseries.

UNITED COMMUNITY DEFENSE SERVICES

THE United Community Defense Services came into being "to assist in the development of essential health and welfare services to people in communities that are unable to cope adequately with defense-created needs."* These needs extend over a wide area and include many serious problems that confront families and children who live in already congested urban areas involved in defense activities or in those areas of mushroom growth created by the establishment of large new defense plants. Housing shortages, inadequate provisions for education, and recreation have been added to the lack of appropriate medical care or programs for the preservation of public health, as well as lack of adequate resources for essential social services.

Day care is one of the most pressing needs in areas affected by the current emergency. Of the 14 national agencies comprising UCDS, the Child Welfare League is the agency most directly concerned and is focusing much effort on this problem. The League is providing consultation throughout the country to the many communities designated as critical areas. In the first nine months of 1951, 105 different communities have received on-the-spot help—either consultation or information or advice—in establishing day care agencies in accordance with accepted standards.

To help the League perform this job, the UCDS during 1951 has allocated \$10,230 for expansion of the League's day care staff.

The UCDS, as a member of the United Defense Fund, is supported through Community Chest Red

*From Articles of Incorporation, United Community Defense Services.

Feather campaigns. The experience of the Child Welfare League in providing day care consultation to communities upon which the defense effort is having its impact gives evidence that critically important service is being provided through this community support.

CONFERENCES

The Eastern Regional Conference will be held February 6, 7, 8, 1952, in Philadelphia, Pa. Headquarters will be the Sylvania Hotel. Mr. Walter P. Townsend, General Secretary, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, is chairman.

The Southern Regional Conference will be held March 13, 14, 15, 1952, in Raleigh, N. C. Headquarters will be the Sir Walter Hotel. Dr. Ellen B. Winston, State Department of Public Welfare, Atlanta, Ga., is chairman.

The Central Regional Conference will be held March 31 and April 1, 2, 1952, in Detroit, Mich. Headquarters will be the Statler Hotel. Mr. Fred R. Johnson, General Secretary, The Michigan Children's Aid Society, Detroit, is chairman.

The New England Regional Conference will be held June 9, 10, 1952, in Poland Springs, Maine. Miss Helen M. Wheeler, Director, South End Day Nursery, Boston, Mass., is chairman.

The Midwest Regional Conference will be held September 25, 26, 27, 1952, in Des Moines, Iowa. Headquarters will be the Hotel Savery. Mr. George Westby, Executive Director, Lutheran Welfare Society of Iowa, Des Moines, is chairman.

The South Pacific Regional Conference will be held in Long Beach, California, May 1, 2, 3, 1952. Headquarters have not been determined. Mr. Clyde S. Pritchard, Executive Secretary, Children's Bureau of Los Angeles, is chairman.

The Southwest Regional Conference will be held April 27, 28, 29, 1952, in Austin, Texas. Headquarters have not been determined. Miss Rosalind Giles, Director, Division of Child Care, State Department of Public Welfare, Austin, is chairman.

The National Conference of Social Work will be held May 25-30, in Chicago. Headquarters for the Child Welfare League of America will be the Congress Hotel. The League's program for National Conference in 1952 is being planned by a national committee which is working through regional subcommittees. Mrs. Nora Phillips Johnson, New York City, is national chairman; Miss Martha Branscombe, Chicago, is chairman for the Midwest subcommittee; and Mr. Clyde Getz, Los Angeles, chairman for the West Coast subcommittee.

BASIC PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE TO ALL CHILD WELFARE AGENCIES

(Continued from page 9)

VIII. Child welfare agencies should take an active and objective role in helping to plan and sustain, on a community-wide basis, a well coordinated child care program, both public and private. Such a program should be based on the current needs of the children in the community in relation to services currently available. Local problems should be the concern of the local community agencies and organizations which should assume responsibility for planning and providing services in accordance with its size and the existing resources. State and federal funds available should be utilized to meet local needs.

IX. Child welfare constitutes a specialized part of the field of social work. When foster care is necessary child welfare agencies must assume many and sometimes all of the parental responsibilities. It should be recognized that child welfare services must be provided by personnel with the appropriate professional training. Therefore, child welfare agencies should regard the employment of professionally trained staff as essential and should encourage the development of professional education on graduate levels, as well as the development of sound in-service training programs.

X. The agency program is conducted through the combined services of board, executive and staff.* Each should work within a defined area of responsibility, distinct yet interdependent. The performance of one must necessarily depend upon the performance of the other to produce stability and coherence. It is, therefore, essential that all parts of the agency be well-informed on its activities. Organization of the agency should provide channels for this purpose to enable the executive and staff to contribute towards the formulation of policy and program development.

New League Provisionals

Hathaway Home
840 North Avenue 66
Los Angeles 42, California
Miss Maxine Elliott, Executive Director

Volunteers of America of Los Angeles
333 South Los Angeles Street
Los Angeles 13, California
Lt. Col. Harold M. Eroh, Executive Director

Child Welfare Services
Department of Public Welfare
Box 1391
Santa Fe, New Mexico
Miss Hazel M. Young, Supervisor

Division of Child Welfare
State Department of Public Welfare
Tribune Tower
Austin, Texas
Miss Rosalind Giles, Director

* In a public agency without a policy-making board, this may take the form of an Advisory Committee.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Is a Social Service Exchange Necessary?

THIS article presents the experience of one community in studying the usefulness of the Social Service Exchange, and explains why it decided to discontinue this resource and with what results. Further discussion of this subject is invited.—Ed.

FOLLOWING a two-year study, the Social Service Exchange in Greenwich, Connecticut, was discontinued in January, 1951. The study is of interest in itself, reflecting as it does an achievement in community planning. The Exchange, established in 1927 for the purpose of avoiding duplication of services among relief-giving agencies, had served its purpose effectively during the era when relief-giving was regarded as the primary function of social and charitable organizations. As the intervening years brought about a notable change in this point of view, community planning advanced in accordance with the changing trends in social work. Agencies with similar functions within the community had been consolidated, and coordination of all community services developed to an appreciable degree. Meanwhile agreement had been reached in the social work field that the purpose of the Social Service Exchange was no longer to avoid duplication, but to enhance service to clients.

In January, 1949, the Social Work Planning Committee of the Greenwich Community Council requested the appointment of a special committee to review the current practices and effectiveness of the Exchange, and to make recommendations for any changes indicated.

Accordingly a special committee of nine persons, including three laymen and six professional workers, embarked on this undertaking within the next few months. They devoted considerable time to reviewing current literature on the philosophy and practices of Social Service Exchanges; to studying the historical development of the Exchange in Greenwich, as well as within the entire field; and met at intervals for discussion. All agencies using the Exchange were asked to read the basic material, to have staff and board discussions about it, and to report their opinions to the committee.

The committee had agreed on two basic principles: first, that the primary function of the Exchange is to improve services to the clients using the agencies; and second, that to safeguard the confidentiality of the client's relationship to the agency (or agencies), membership requirements must be fulfilled in order to use the Exchange.

The response from agencies at this initial stage in the study indicated a divided opinion as to the value

of the Exchange. Some questioned whether it was needed at all, or whether it really helped to improve service to the client, whereas others believed this resource was needed and wished to continue using it. Therefore the committee, proceeding on the assumption that the Exchange was needed, drew up a set of tentative membership requirements, which upon careful examination were laid aside as too theoretical for practical use.

It was then decided to extend the study to all the agencies within the community, so that specific information might be available regarding the current use and effectiveness of the Exchange in Greenwich. This second phase of the project was conducted over a period of six months (January-June, 1950). Work sheets were drafted for the use of the agencies' workers, who listed the number of instances in which the value of the information received was "nil," "useful," or "great." Out of 540 clearings with the Exchange, 34 were "useful"; 10 were of "great use." Further examination of these 34 showed that the information could have been obtained by calling other local agencies directly, rather than first checking through the Exchange. Another interesting result was that on 211 registrations the information was "not used." Thus the committee was led to consider just how helpful the Exchange was in this community.

On the basis of the findings thus far, the committee decided to further its study by recommending a suspension of operation of the Exchange for a three-months' period (October-December, 1950) in order to test the validity of its service. Again the agencies participated by keeping count of all instances wherein the absence of the Exchange interfered with service to clients. Only one agency reported that there were two cases in which this resource would have been helpful. Others told of having felt handicapped at the outset, but gradually realizing that the traditional use of the Exchange did not necessarily help the client. Another regarded it as a procedural device that could be abandoned without interfering with services to clients.

The facts revealed prompted the committee to recommend unanimously that the Greenwich Social Service Exchange be discontinued, and the Council concurred in the recommendation. It was pointed out in the final report that in our community there is very little duplication of function among the agencies, and these seem well understood by the people who use the services. Realizing the importance of the step it had taken, the committee further suggested that if at any time a revival of the Exchange seemed indicated, a committee be appointed to re-examine the situation. Consideration was also given to out-of-town agencies within the state and neighboring communities, to

whom letters were sent describing the functions of the Greenwich agencies and stating their willingness to be approached directly for information.

Since the suspension of the Exchange in January, 1951, the experience of the trial period has been borne out. The number of inquiries from out-of-town agencies to the Council office has been minimal, and in each instance these have been directed to the respective local agencies whose functions are appropriate. Among the local agencies it is doubtful if any essential difference has been felt. This applies to all areas of service, including specific services such as child placement, day care and recruitment of foster homes. Occasional questions raised have been entirely theoretical and with no apparent indication of affecting actual services to the clients. Direct communication between the agencies has continued; but for the most part, the impression is conveyed that pertinent information about the client's contact with an agency is available from the client himself.

However, in order to evaluate objectively the results of so important a venture, a careful review of the situation is considered logical. Thus by means of the same method and procedure that brought about our departure from a traditional use of the Exchange, we hope to evaluate the advantages or disadvantages that may have ensued.

The entire project has been of great interest and inspiration to those participating. It has provided a notable experience in community planning in which each agency has had the opportunity to examine and define clearly its own function. One important conclusion emerging from this experience is that the function and use of a resource such as the Social Service Exchange can be adapted to the specific needs and patterns of a community.

MARY A. SWEENEY

Casework Supervisor, The Greenwich Center for Child and Family Service, Greenwich, Conn.

New Psychiatric Training Program

PLANS have been worked out for a new residency psychiatric training program to be conducted jointly by the Jewish Child Care Association of New York and Hillside Hospital. The move, which opens an important channel for teamwork between psychiatrists and social workers in the development of healthy personalities of children, has been authorized and certified by the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, and the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology.

Under the terms of the joint plan, the Jewish Child Care Association's Pleasantville Cottage School will serve as the training center during a third year of the

formal three-year residency teaching program of Hillside Hospital for doctors wishing to specialize in psychiatry. Plans call for the inauguration of the program by January, 1952.

Dr. Clarence P. Oberndorf, Director of Psychiatry for the agency, and Dr. Joseph S. A. Miller, Medical Director of the Hospital, in a joint announcement, stated that "both the Jewish Child Care Association of New York and Hillside Hospital stand to derive important benefits from the new residency training program in psychiatry, which represents the culmination of a well-established relationship under which psychiatrists from the hospital have been serving on the staff and panel of psychiatrists of the child care agency. . . . When the new program is launched, the Jewish Child Care Association will have additional psychiatric services for the children, and a group of psychiatrists who may possibly specialize in child psychiatry will be trained to be more fully aware of the problems and needs of children placed in care away from their own homes."

Board Member Institute

THE Federation of Protestant Welfare agencies of New York City conducted its Ninth Board Member Institute in October. The program was planned with special reference to present-day factors that increase tensions or create new tensions in our daily living. In view of the great interest of agencies in defining the nature and scope of board member responsibility, the content of the discussion is especially interesting and we note the following topics presented for study and discussion under expert leadership:

- Working with unsettled youth
- Utilizing skills of the aging
- Methods of self-evaluation of agencies
- Forming alliances with public agencies
- Expanding services for children
- Reaching the heart of the community through its eyes and ears, a consideration of the board member's role in gaining public understanding.

Adelphi College School of Social Work

SEPTEMBER 25 marked the opening for the first time in 22 years of a new, fully accredited school of social work in the New York metropolitan area. The Adelphi College School of Social Work began its third year of operation and first since accreditation by the American Association of Schools of Social Work with a capacity enrollment in both its first and second year classes.

Not since 1929 has a school of social work been accredited in the environs of New York City. Adelphi is one of three such schools training professional social workers in the metropolitan area and one of four in the state.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX PROCEDURES FOR CHILD-PLACING AGENCIES AND FOSTER PARENTS

IN OCTOBER, 1949, CHILD WELFARE published some detailed information on Federal income tax procedures in connection with money received by foster parents for boarding children. This had been secured by Mrs. Henrietta L. Gordon of the Child Welfare League and Miss I. Evelyn Smith of the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency in response to numerous inquiries which both organizations had received.

Recently the Children's Bureau has received some fresh interpretation on this subject, which it has shared with the League and which we are reporting as promptly as possible, although it is evident that further information will be required.

A recent statement made to the Children's Bureau by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue contained the following decision:

"It is the opinion of this office that where the payment made by the child-placing agency is solely for reimbursement of expenses incurred by the foster parents in taking care of the child and is in an amount not in excess of such expenses, neither said expenditures nor the reimbursements therefor need be reflected in the Federal income tax return of the foster parent and the child-placing agencies are not required to file annual information returns under section 147 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to said maintenance payments."

This decision reverses the previous statement, made in July, 1949, with respect to the reporting agencies and foster parents. This statement, as published in CHILD WELFARE, is as follows:

"If a child-placing agency pays an amount in excess of \$600 a year to a boarding parent, it is necessary for the agency to report the payment on Form 1099, along with payments to staff and other individuals. The report does not necessarily mean that the boarding parent will have to pay a tax on this amount."*

This decision, which removes the \$600 base for reporting income received from board payments for children under agency care, will be of interest to many agencies and many boarding parents. It will be necessary, however, to secure additional information and interpretation before determining how it applies to specific situations. Further statements on this important question will be issued as promptly as developments permit.

* CHILD WELFARE, October, 1949.

BOOK NOTES

PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES IN SOCIAL CASEWORK, SELECTED ARTICLES, 1940-1950, Cora Kasius, Editor. Family Service Association of America, New York. 1951. 433 pp. \$4.50.

Miss Kasius in her foreword to this book writes, "Because this compilation reflects the major trends of the period, it is hoped it will be a valuable source of reference." Actually, while this is a collection of 32 articles published over a ten-year period in the "Voice" (regardless of the various titles *Social Casework* has carried throughout the years, it has been that), the book does not give the effect of a collection, but of an entity—that entity being social casework. Readers in this country or abroad, social work practitioners or others seeking information regarding the philosophy, teaching, supervision and practice of social casework, may find one or several articles pertaining to their general interests, but to get these properly oriented, they will be irresistibly led to the book as a whole. The worker in a specialized setting, family, child welfare, medical or other, will not find any specific material related to her specialization to inform or guide her. Rather, in the section on philosophy, she will have the opportunity to review the history of her profession; to see more clearly the logical development of its *raison d'être*; to learn what forces have worked upon it which have made for changes, differences, the development of the specializations; and to refresh her spirit in sharing in the body of thought which has gone into the foundations of social work in this country and the evolution of social casework. The last papers in Part I which present the two Europeans' views of American social work have for us that special value which comes from looking at ourselves through the more objective eyes of another person. Furthermore, for the European workers who are increasingly coming to see for themselves by working with us, or who are wanting to learn about us through reading, these clear-sighted interpretations may carry an authenticity and awareness of our own need which speak more clearly than the papers by American leaders in social work thought and practice.

Part II—"Teaching and Supervision"—carries the reader from ideology into activity. Here one gets the discussions pro and con of how social caseworkers acquire their working body of knowledge; what that body of knowledge should be in terms of school curriculums, field placements and continuing practice; what strategic values there are in dynamic supervision; what are the norms of development, and sound expectations as experience increases. This section is particularly rich in the stimulation it gives any supervisor, regardless of her specialty or the experiences of her workers. Here, in each paper, one gets

the feel of some aspect of reliving one's own professional development, resulting in more ready identification with a worker who is undergoing the stress of integration. Here one can gain understanding about the newly-graduated staff worker who has a generic foundation on which she operates with a degree of competence, but needs close supervisory help in orienting herself to a specific job, such as the multitudinous details and facets involved in just one aspect of work with children—namely, placement.

For the older supervisor, this section is exciting reading, as it affords her the opportunity to have readily available and grouped together these thoughtful and extremely practical articles focussed on her responsibilities and her problems, and revitalizing her understanding of herself, her methods, her workers and their needs.

Keeping in mind the fact that this book is intended to be useful to two groups of readers, those desiring knowledge and information regarding social casework and those who are practitioners, the third section of this book—"Casework Practice"—is both enlightening and puzzling. Here one finds certain specifics in terms of methods used; discussions on definitions of terminology; differentials in levels of treatment; elaborations and explanations of analytical techniques which the social caseworker needs to understand and modify in her own practice; efforts to clarify what the caseworker, as distinguished from the analyst or psychiatrist, can and cannot accomplish. It is as though one enters a forest seeking a single trail and finds many. One realizes that as yet the trail is not clearly defined, but that many are working on it with great activity, vitality, and purposeful and honest effort, to test, to study, to learn from others and from their own experiences how best to reach their goal.

We might wish for more specific direction in interviewing, in recording, in establishing relationship, in dealing with transference and counter-transference, but these are techniques which we can work on, using the guides which have been given us. We might wish, too, that the authors had been identified, so that we knew what positions they hold and by what authority they speak.

MAYBELLE J. BURNER

District Supervisor, Children's Services, Cleveland, Ohio

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PREADOLESCENT, by Arthur Witt Blair and William H. Burton. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York. 1951. 221 pp. \$2.25.

This book fills a real need because it deals with the development of children from nine to twelve years of age. The literature on this age group previously has

been scattered through journals and other publications, so that this survey represents an important service in summarizing what is known about the preadolescent and making it available in convenient form. Moreover, the interpretations and comments of the authors are a valuable addition to the material which they have gathered from a variety of sources.

Following an introductory chapter, there are chapters on the changing social relationships of the preadolescent, the effects of cultural influences, physical development in relation to behavior, intellectual development in relation to behavior, the general characteristics of preadolescence, guidance of preadolescent development, and suggestions for further research. It is obvious that these topics are of as much interest to social workers as they are to parents and teachers, to whom the book is primarily addressed.

Social workers will certainly be intrigued by the discussions of parent-child relationships, emotional conflicts, social adjustments and maladjustments, which seem to be common for children from nine to twelve years old. They will wish to know, for example, that this is an age when children turn away from or against parents, who react with exasperation or rejection of the children; that this is the period when gang loyalties are paramount, but not inevitably bad influences on development; that this is the time when sex differences become marked, and there are extreme antagonisms between boys and girls as they strive for masculine and feminine identifications, respectively; that this is the developmental period when the child turns from fantasy to keen interest in the world of reality, and when the love of reading is great (except for those children who have failed to learn to read or who are handicapped by reading disabilities).

Since this is also an age when children are least accessible to the efforts of caseworkers and psychotherapists, although somewhat more approachable in group therapy than individually, we certainly need to know as much about the preadolescent's nature and needs as possible. The book should help us to understand the preadolescent and for this reason is recommended reading.

PHYLLIS BLANCHARD, Ph.D.

Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic, Philadelphia, Pa.



THE NURSERY SCHOOL, by Katherine H. Read. W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia. 1950. 264 pp. \$3.75.

This is the first book to deal realistically and adequately with the nursery school as a human relations laboratory where the dynamics of behavior and rela-

tionships can be observed and studied. For this reason Katherine Read's *The Nursery School* is as useful and important for child welfare workers as it is for nursery school teachers, psychologists and educators in general. Part I, "Getting Acquainted With the Laboratory," starts out with a brief and matter-of-fact discussion of differences in adults as well as children, and the necessity of understanding ourselves and accepting our own feelings if we are to understand and help children. The discussion of the program, equipment and schedules of different types of nursery schools is concise and clear cut, subordinated purposely to the book's main concern, i.e., the use of the nursery school as a human relations laboratory. Both the omission of detail and the excellence of illustrative examples contribute to a vivid and interesting picture of what constitutes a good nursery school. The criteria of good nursery school education for young children are sound, definite and clear. The curriculum, too, is adequately though briefly considered. Anyone who wonders "What do children learn in nursery school?" would do well to read carefully Miss Read's discussion of art, music, science, literature and social studies for two-, three- and four-year-olds.

Part II, "Exploring Areas of Common Experience," is written specifically for adults who are actually studying human relations in a nursery school. To this reviewer the sections on "Helping Children in Routine Situations" and what the author calls "Guides to Speech and Action" are among the most useful in the book. The author rightly assumes that adults studying children in a nursery school setting are serving as participating members of the staff and not merely as observers. Whether they are student teachers, social workers, pediatric or psychiatric interns, or parents, becoming involved and learning to understand their own feelings is an essential factor in learning to work with children in or out of school. The fourteen points (e.g., "give the child a choice only when you intend to leave the situation up to him") which are given as guides as to what to say and do in a nursery school apply also in family relationships. Child welfare workers would do well to see how such "guides" could be modified and adapted to help the parents with whom they work get on better with their children at home.

From the point of view of understanding human relationships, Part III, "Understanding Feelings in Areas Where Feelings are Strong," is a particularly valuable section. This discussion of emotional behavior is oversimplified, but on the whole, sound. The foundations for feeling adequate and confident are discussed in terms of early experiences of finding the world a reasonably friendly and comfortable place.

Again what can be observed and learned about what helps or hinders children's development in a nursery school applies equally to living with children in families or other group situations. The author makes it clear and sensible why children need to have their feelings and behavior accepted, to find acceptable outlets for their strong feelings, to live with adults who understand the ways of growth and who are skillful in setting limits and guiding and correcting

children's behavior. Because this book describes the behavior of real children with normal problems and is based on long and successful experience of helping children learn to become more adequate and more secure, it has much wisdom to share with all adults responsible for giving children a good start in life.

MARY FISHER LANGMUIR, Ph.D.

*Wimpfheimer Nursery School, Department of Child Study
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.*

CLASSIFIED AD SERVICE

Insertion of five lines of six words each is made at the minimum rate of \$2.50. For each additional line, or a fraction thereof, the charge is 50 cents. Closing date is the eighth of the month prior to the month of issue. A check should accompany the order.

OPENING FOR CASEWORKER in nonsectarian voluntary institution offering a casework service to emotionally disturbed children and their parents. Psychiatric treatment also available to children. Qualifications master's degree in social work plus experience in working with parent-child relationships. Good personnel practices. Salary range to \$4560 commensurate with experience. Institution is part agency also offering foster home and adoption services. For full information write Children's Services of Connecticut, 1680 Albany Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.

DISTRICT CONSULTANTS with full training, five years' experience. Good salary. Member CWLA. Write Child Welfare Director, Department of Public Assistance, Box 1189, Boise, Idaho.

GRADUATE CASEWORKER—Placement agency has one opening. Excellent psychiatric consultation. Salary range, \$262.34-\$397.34. Write Morris H. Price, Assistant Director, Jewish Children's Bureau, 231 S. Wells St., Chicago 4, Ill.

SUPERVISOR in charge of Child Care Department, \$4500-\$5500. Requirements: graduate degree plus two years' experience in supervision. Staff psychiatrist, good personnel practices. Write Milton Goldman, Jewish Family and Children's Bureau, 319 W. Monument St., Baltimore 1, Md.

CASEWORKER—Opening in private nonsectarian children's agency. Master's degree in social work and experience in foster home placement required. Good salary range. For information write Michigan Children's Aid Society, 200 E. Kearsley St., Flint, Mich.

COUNSELOR with caseload primarily in parent-child problems. Numerous articles to professional journals contributed by staff which has experimental point of view. Psychiatric consultation. Beautiful city of inland lakes. Good opportunities for cultural interests or sports. Salary to \$4700. Child guidance experience desirable. Apply Callman Rawley, Jewish Family and Children's Service, 404 S. 8th St., Minneapolis, Minn.

CASEWORKER—We have place for mature person who has experience in home finding and who likes to work with growing children. Must have at least one year graduate work. Social Security and John Hancock plans. Write Nebraska Children's Home Society, 3549 Fontenelle Blvd., Omaha 4, Neb.

SUPERVISOR-CASEWORKER for nonsectarian Community Chest agency for unmarried parents. Has own maternity home and hospital. Pleasant living quarters if desired. Good personnel standards and practices. Graduate of accredited school, with experience in casework practice and supervision. Budgeted salary range of \$3600-\$4000 might be extended if experience were to warrant it. Write to Miss Elinor M. Mullen, Executive Secretary, Ingleside, 70 Harvard Pl., Buffalo, N. Y.

CASEWORKER with full professional training and experience in adoption work, opening in new adoption program in established child care agency. Salary, commensurate with qualifications, up to \$4500. Apply to Sheltering Arms Children's Service, 122 E. 29th St., N. Y. 16, N. Y.

CASEWORKER, professionally trained, for expanding program in children's agency specializing in temporary foster home care. Salary range \$3100-\$3900. Write Miss Merle MacMahon, Windham Children's Service, 2112 Broadway, N. Y. 23, N. Y.

CASEWORKERS, particularly those interested in adoption service and child placement, will find real opportunity in recently reorganized multiple service program; good supervision, student training program, psychiatric consultation. Reasonable caseloads and good personnel practices. Salary from \$3000 in accord with experience. Family and Children's Service, 410 Liberty Ave., Pittsburgh 22, Pa.

CASEWORKER for child placement agency. Trained. Experience with foster care, unwed parents and adoptions preferred. CWLA member. Consulting psychiatrist. Close supervision and limited load. Student unit. Salary range \$2700-\$3900. Children's Bureau, 225 N. Jefferson St., Dayton, Ohio.

CASEWORKER for child placement department in multiple service agency. Prefer experienced practitioner but will consider beginner. Salary range \$3000-\$4500, depending on qualifications. Jewish Family and Children's Service, 15 Fernando St., Pittsburgh 19, Pa.

CASEWORKER, S. W. graduate for small progressive family and children's agency on edge of Poconos. Good opportunity for growth. \$3000 plus credit for experience. United Charities, 107 Madison Ave., W. Hazleton, Pa.

SENIOR CASEWORKER for private multiple function children's agency. Graduate training and foster home placement experience preferred. Salary dependent upon qualifications. Agency provisional CWLA member. Challenging opportunity for person with initiative and ability to grow with job. Possibility for supervisory responsibilities. Write Director, Children's Center, 110 W. McBee Ave., Greenville, S. C.

NURSERY CENTER CASEWORKER, mature, well qualified and experienced, for well established children's agency. Write Dallas Day Nursery, 2017 S. Ervay St., Dallas, Tex.

SUPERVISOR—Casework for agency with supervised foster home and residential institution for children. Requires full professional training and supervisory experience in child welfare. Salary commensurate with experience from \$4000. National Health and Welfare Retirement—Social Security—CWLA membership. Write Hillside Children's Center, 1183 Monroe Ave., Rochester 20, N. Y.

MARY IRENE ATKINSON SPEAKING FOR CHILDREN

By CHENEY C. JONES and GERTRUDE SPRINGER, Editors

Parthenon Press, Nashville, Tennessee

A book not about, but of Mary Irene Atkinson, prepared by friends as a living memorial that many may have a comradeship which some of us were privileged to enjoy.

For students, board members, staff members and for all those others concerned with the welfare of children, this book brings a bird's-eye view of the development in services to children as seen through the eyes of a great friend of children.

Now available through the Child Welfare League of America for immediate and Christmas buying for the special price of \$1.00.

Day Care Packets Help Answer Day Care Questions

DAY CARE PACKET SERIES

Now available from the League: Day Care Packet No. 1 (price \$1.60 plus postage)

Day Care Packet #1 relates to starting a private nursery school. It provides information on professional standards and an introduction to the operation of group programs for young children.

Additional packets will follow. Among the subjects planned are community planning for day care; administrative aids; educational, casework and health programs; and others. Contents will be drawn from the various professional fields allied in day care programs, and will reflect the experience of many communities.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

Officers

MARSHALL FIELD, President
NEW YORK

MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD, Vice-Pres.
NEW YORK

LEONARD W. MAYO, Vice-Pres.
NEW YORK

GEORGE A. NEWBURY, Vice-Pres.
BUFFALO

C. F. RAMSAY, Vice-Pres.
ANN ARBOR

MISS GRACE A. REEDER, Secretary
ALBANY

SPENCER H. CROOKES, Exec. Dir.
JOSEPH H. REID, Asst. Exec. Dir.

MRS. HERBERT F. FISHER, Treasurer
HARTFORD

Board of Directors

REV. JESSE F. ANDERSON, Philadelphia, Pa.
DR. LEONA BAUMGARTNER, New York, N. Y.
MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH, Cambridge, Mass.
RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN B. BUTLER, St. Louis, Mo.
MRS. GEORGE P. EDMONDS, Wilmington, Del.
GEORGE FAHEY, Seattle, Washington
MRS. KENDAL FROST, Los Angeles, Calif.
MISS E. MARGUERITE GANE, Buffalo, N. Y.
MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER, Washington, D. C.

MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER, New York, N. Y.
SHELBY M. HARRISON, New York, N. Y.
C. ELLIS HENICAN, New Orleans, La.
MRS. HENRY HITCHCOCK, Chesterfield, Mo.
MRS. J. HORTON IJAMS, New York, N. Y.
MISS KATHARINE F. LENROOT, Hartsdale, N. Y.
ROBERT McDUGAL, JR., Chicago, Ill.
MRS. CHARLES S. MONROE, Forest Hills, N. Y.
THOMAS M. PETERS, New York, N. Y.

JULIUS F. ROTHMAN, New York, N. Y.
RANDEL SHAKE, Indianapolis, Ind.
WALTER N. THAYER, New York, N. Y.
WALTER P. TOWNSEND, Philadelphia, Pa.
MALCOLM VILAS, Cleveland, Ohio
MRS. GEORGE L. WEST, Pittsburgh, Pa.
MISS LOIS WILDY, Chicago, Ill.
MRS. RAY W. WILLOUGHBY, San Angelo, Texas
KERNS WRIGHT, Van Wert, Ohio